DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 252 HE 012 726

AUTHOR Vallance, Elizabeth
TITLE Public Service as a Curricular Problem: The Land-Grant Tradition and the Commonplaces.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 17p.: Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Boston, MA, April 1980)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Standards; Adult Students; College Curriculum; College Students; *Credit Courses; *Curriculum Problems; Educational History; Educational Philosophy; *Extension Education; Higher Education; *Land Grant Universities; Part Time Students; *Resource Allocation; Rural Extension; State Universities; *Student Needs

ABSTRACT

Curricular considerations concerning extension education to primarily adult and part-time students are discussed with emphasis on courses offered for credit. Some historical notes on land-grant colleges are presented. Seven conditions under which off-campus public-service-oriented (directed to the general public) instruction becomes a curricular question are suggested: (1) when the off-campus program competes with the regular on-campus program for scarce instructional resources; (2) when demands of "public-service" instruction make content and other curricular demands not normally encountered in the regular curriculum; (3) when a public-service commitment suggests a need for new standards in admissions, faculty hiring, grading, and other areas; (4) when outreach programming results in questions that cannot be routinely handled by the structures already in existence; (5) when the student beneficiaries of public-service teaching programs begin demanding something more than simply the courses themselves (academic advising, etc.); (6) if public-service credit instruction threatens (or helps) accreditation by regional or professional accrediting agencies; and (7) when it threatens to become firmly ensconced at the institution and thus to intrude regularly into other institutional decisions. It is suggested that outreach courses present a curricular problem when they affect the established curriculum as in any of the seven ways cited above. Changes resulting from these conditions may take several forms, including changing course offerings available to on-campus students. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Public Service as a Curricular Problem: The Land-Grant Tradition and the Commonplaces

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Elizabeth Vallance
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

by

Elizabeth Vallance
Kansas State University

ED187252

(Prepared for presentation at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, Boston, April 1980)

Introduction

My original intent here was to address what seemed like a fairly straightforward issue -- the extent to which offering credit courses at remote outreach locations poses a curricular problem for an institution, using land-grant colleges as a convenient example. It soon became apparent, however, that the question is really at least two: the concept of public service, curricularly defined, is an interesting problem in itself, but it presumes that the phrase "a curricular problem" has a common accepted meaning. I think it doesn't and that therefore it is worth some attention. So I will deal with both issues. While this paper makes some historical notes, it is also an essay on the nature of the curriculum field itself. In both respects the paper is necessarily incomplete; but it is a start.

Before plunging ahead, I must acknowledge two criticisms that were levelled at this paper in its proposal stage, both having to do with some claims I had made about land-grant colleges. The first alleged that there really is no "land-grant philosophy", as I had called it in an earlier draft; the second reminded me that land-grant universities do not have the monopoly on public service through instruction. Both arguments, I am sure, are true. Only a romantic can claim that the land-grant colleges were united by a single philosophy at their inception a century ago; it would be worse than romantic to claim that those universities are currently united by any such philosophy. We actually have only the Morrill Act itself, an imminently practical tract which establishes the purpose of endowing, supporting, and maintaining

> at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are

HE 012 726

> related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, in such manner as the legislature of the States may respectively perscribe, in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life. (Carey 1977, p. 24).

It is only later interpretations of that Act and of its setting in history which argue that it was intended to democratize knowledge (Breinmyer 1978) or that it was a deliberate effort to bring the American university structure into a new and more egalitarian era than the elitist private colleges had created (Houle 1974). And it is certainly true that other institutions besides land-grant universities have developed active and healthy instructional outreach programs which look mightily like public service.

Still, however, it can be argued that the Morrill Act did provide a common bond to a far-flung system of public institutions, and that in doing so it created a more explicitly shared common concern than was true of any other group of public or private institutions. The land-grant tradition (if not "philosophy") gives (say) Kansas State University and Michigan State University more in common with each other than the Universities of Kansas and of Michigan necessarily have; certainly whatever commonalities the Morrill Act alone provided were reinforced a half-century later with the Smith-Lever Act (1914), which created the Cooperative Extension services in the various states. Today, of course, state and municipal institutions alike feel impelled to structure their programs so as to serve the broader publics which support them, and by now the public-service functions of land-grant colleges are scarcely distinguishable from those of other non-private institutions. The distinction is more a historic than a current one. I suspect, however, that the possessiveness which the people of Kansas (especially rural Kansas) exhibit toward Kansas State University (largely because of KSU's visible presence in every county, through Extension) would result in a small uproar were KSU to suddenly withdraw from outreach programming; it would be easier (though still not easy) for KU to retrench. An Iowa State University historian has argued that while "there can be no doubt that the (land-grant) colleges have been a

powerful influence in broadening the American concept of what is properly a subject to be taught at the university level, as was intended...,"

> perhaps the most important contribution of all has been the ideal and practice of direct service to the public beyond the campus. The University of Wisconsin may have appropriated the concept in its slogan, but land-grant colleges generally, beginning with special attention to farmers, constantly broadened their constituencies, and other institutions, public and private alike, have long ago followed the example by including services as one of their vital activities, and literally carrying the services to every nook and cranny of a state. (Geiger 1978, p. 31)

One final reason for focusing on land-grant universities (and especially my current place of employment) is simply that some focus seemed essential and the land-grant college is the most blatantly public-service-oriented institution we have. None of my remarks here are intended to refer to the land-grant situation as if it were truly unique; it is simply offered as the clearest example of some larger points I will be making.

Some quick definitions to clear the way for the arguments I will make: "Public service" by educational institutions is used here to refer to those activities (credit or non-credit) aimed at the general public, as distinct from the regular curriculum afforded to the captive clientele at the home institution. Public service activities may be aimed at any age group, and are; however, courses taught in "outreach" locations (remote from the central campus) generally reach adults who, by virtue of family or job responsibilities, can rarely take more than one or two such courses at a time. The students of public-service courses, then, tend to be part-time students. Their course needs define the market demand that the public service program must meet; the demand is usually phrased in terms of single courses, and only rarely in terms of full curricular sequences -- therefore the public-service-oriented "curriculum", such as it is, has an incomplete and fragmented quality. This is true of both credit and non-credit public-service curricula. I'll be dealing mostly with the credit aspect, since the sanction of credentialling imposes interesting constraints on the decision-making process, though (as we shall see) public service as an institutional responsibility

is partly traceable to the non-credit activities of land-grant schools.

Some curious curricular patterns

We must keep in mind that at the time of the Morrill Act (1862), college education as we know it today was hardly in high demand. In 1860 the courses preparatory to college work were not publically available -- those students who did receive a secondary education did so in some 6,000 private academies, most of them east of the Missippi (Geiger 1978, p. 24). By three decades later (1889), secondary-school attendance was still at less than 1% of the population (Krug 1964). The concept of the high school as the "people's college" had not yet taken hold, and would not until the turn of the century; the familiar pattern of upping the ante to require increasingly higher levels of certification was barely a glimmer in anyone's eye, except perhaps, that of Harvard's President Eliot (Vallance 1973/74). College education was (for better or worse) restricted to a select few, and those mostly in the already-traditional private colleges which did not pretend to populist goals of any kind. Few people attended high school; fewer finished; fewer still went on to college. It is safe to assume that under these conditions relatively few people would consider the absence of a college degree a hardship to be overcome; demand for public-service college-level instruction was nearly nil.

There was, however, an egalitarian spirit in the land, and it is noteworthy that the Morrill Act was finally signed into law by Abraham Lincoln (President Buchanan having vetoed the preceding version, three years before). There are some who argue that the Act itself would never have been passed in peacetime, since the war kept most of the traditional opponents of democratized education (that is to say, the southerners) from participating in the vote (Breimyer 1978, p. 8). The Morrill Act acknowledged, implicitly if not explicitly, that large and vital classes of people were being denied the higher training that a college education could provide; it sought to remedy that discrepancy.

With fewer than one percent of the population attending high school, however,

the land-grant colleges could not instantly start remedying the situation all on their own, at least not under the guise of post-secondary education as we know it. Kansas State University (one of several claiming the distinction of being the first land-grant college) was for a number of years little more than a glorified high school. The local high school, in fact, was not inspired to strengthen its own curriculum until the college tightened its standards and required certain minimum coursework for entry, a pattern that was common nationwide as well and could probably be traced to President Eliot's Committee of Ten (1892) recommendations about the articulation between the secondary school and the college curriculum. "In short, a secondary school system of a new sort had to come into being at the very time the land-grant colleges were themselves being formed" (Geiger 1978, p. 24), but it came into being only gradually.

In 1914, one year after the Kansas State Agricultural College (as it was then called) was clearly differentiated from the high-school preparatory courses offered in town, the Smith-Lever Extension Act was passed, establishing the Cooperative Extension service at land-grant institutions and deliberately thrusting those colleges out into the hinterlands in the interests of service and public edification. The result was that the land-grant college now had an explicitly dual focus: the college curriculum for the regular students, and the non-credit service function of Cooperative Extension. The regular curriculum, of course, was heavily technical in nature, but it was geared toward providing a "liberal education" along with the training in agriculture and the mechanic arts, and it made obvious efforts to provide a balanced and rigorous curriculum. Cooperative Extension, in the tradition of the earlier "farmers' institutes" which had grown up in the rural states, provided direct practical knowledge to farmers and farmers' wives (two apparently very distinct groups), in an effort to break down the isolation and the limiting traditionalism of the family farm. Cooperative extension provided only non-credit offerings and, "indeed, it was through the service and short course programs rather than by formal training leading to a

Bachelor's degree that land-grant colleges really discharged their mission" (Geiger 1978, p. 32).

The resulting dual nature of the instruction offered by the land-grant colleges has, I venture to say, rarely been considered as two aspects of a common endeavor. That is, the campus credit curriculum and the non-credit service function of Cooperative Extension seem generally to be treated as two entirely separate entities. At KSU, for example, the Vice-President for Academic Affairs governs the credit curriculum and its administration in the various KSU colleges (of which Agriculture is one), but a separate Vice-President for Agriculture handles the agricultural experiment stations and Cooperative Extension, among other things. The credit curriculum and non-credit service units meet only in the President, to whom both Vice-Presidents report. Numerous universities have positions called Vice-President for Extension (or some variation on that title) to deal with the far-flung enterprise that Extension really is. It seems quite common to separate those concerns from those of the regular curriculum, and even today the dual nature of land-grant university instruction seems not to be recognized as a curricular problem. It may be fairer to say that the programs are barely aware of one another.

I suggest that there are two reasons for this clear separation: 1) the regular campus curriculum and the Cooperative Extension services <u>do not share the same university resources</u>, especially instructional or administrative resources. The on-campus curriculum decisions are guided by a venerable tradition (stolen from the early private colleges, and in turn from the English and German University systems) embodied in departments, department heads, deans, degree requirements, and fairly baroque internal campus politics. Cooperative Extension is guided by its own Director (or Dean, or VP, or Associate VP, or whatever)(usually a man over 50, I think), has some separate funding, and is less in touch with campus politics than with county offices, federal money, and other networks external to the University itself. The twain almost never meet. 2) The separate resources are

mirrored in the very separate turfs guarded by the two instructional efforts. The regular curriculum serves mostly degree-oriented (and certainly credit-seeking) students, most of them full-time (though this is changing), who come to campus in order to partake of the resources not available elsewhere; the population served by the regular curriculum is roughly 18-25 years of age and concentrated on campus. Those served by Cooperative Extension are scattered throughout the state, in touch with as many separate Extension centers as there are counties, and may be virtually any age; Cooperative Extension serves adults and families. Thus, in terms of both resources and turf, the two instructional efforts of the land-grant colleges are separate creatures. The only deliberate connection I can see is in Extension staff's appropriation of traditional faculty titles (most seem to be Assistant or Associate Professors, albeit largely lacking the doctorate) and in occasional academic departments of adult education, which may offer joint faculty appointments with Extension staff.

I simplify, of course. But the distinction between the traditional college curriculum and the established service functions of Cooperative Extension seems in many ways very clear. I maintain that this in itself raises few problems of a truly curricular nature; curricular problems, under that system, are all relegated to the deans and departments where they belong, and to that extent, the concept of public service does not intrude itself into the deliberations of curriculists.

A third force has arrived noisily on the scene, however, and it threatens to undermine our tidy conceptions of the college curriculum at the same time it forces us to define what a "curricular" problem really is after all. The third force is the movement toward off-campus credit instruction under the various guises of "outreach", "academic outreach", "continuing education", and the like. This movement is as old as several decades in some cases (especially in urban universities) and relatively recent in others (my own rural land-grant academic home being one of them) (Harrington 1977). In any event, this movement of portions of the regular on-campus credit curriculum to locations previously served only by non-credit service

units is probably more revolutionary than we have yet acknowledged.* It has several sources, most of them complex. Off-campus credit teaching may be motivated largely by a desperate search for the vanishing FTEs that used to crowd our campuses; it may be motivated by a need to make money, to the extent that such teaching can make money for an institution; it may be motivated by pressure inadvertently placed by other nearby institutions doing the same thing (our competition with the Other University down the river is legendary and is not limited to football); it may even be motivated by a genuine commitment (by the University? by a department? by a lone instructor?) to Public Service for its own sake. For various reasons, Kansas State University has been in the business of offering off-campus credit courses for about ten years; we offer around a hundred full 3-credit courses throughout the state each semester (all offering regular University credit), not counting a complete undergraduate degree program offered at the nearby military base. It is my job to negotiate with the deans and other academic types to get this off-campus curriculum off-campus. In the process, I find myself running up against new problems which look suspiciously curricular in nature. So, I ask myself (and you, rhetorically), "what are the curricular implications of this public-service version of the traditional college curriculum?" Are there any? Is the question worth considering?

The question is non-trivial

Obviously I think the question is worth considering. I can, however, see some

*I notice, however, that the Concerned Alumni of Princeton seem quite aware of the revolutionary aspects of serving adult students at all. Evidently, although Princeton's Board of Trustees voted in 1978 to allow a limited number of non-degree-seeking "older students" to attend courses, the CAP quickly published an editorial entitled "The Dangers of Adult Education" in its journal. The editorial proclaimed the new idea to be "unsavory" unless the older students could be camouflaged by darkness, though it reminded the readers that the very idea of "night school" is, to all right-thinking people, inherently "unedifying" (Houle 1978, p. 41). I have not tracked down this editorial, but I wonder how the Princeton alums would react to the idea of distinguished Princeton professors travelling to (say) Hackensack to offer courses to the citizenry there.

respects in which I could rightly be accused of undue conceptualizing. Some may well claim that off-campus credit teaching is simply that, no big deal, and not worthy of shiny new conceptual frameworks to describe it. Others may (more rightly) claim that it is largely a logistical and administrative problem, which it is, to some extent; it is hard to claim that such high-level tasks as arranging state cars for instructors, or processing paperwork to cover their costs, or logging their Xeroxing requests, or getting brochure copy to the printer on time -- that any of these jobs merit the trappings of a conceptual exercise. They don't. Many of the jobs involved in off-campus programming are straightforward and non-challenging from a curricular or any other point of view; they are simply done. On many levels, the Big Questions which a curricular approach to public-service teaching would impose are missing.

They shouldn't be, though, and they aren't always. Rather, they can't always be ignored, and sometimes it would be folly. Less enigmatically speaking: decisions arise in off-campus programming which do in fact impinge on the regular curriculum deliberations of an academic unit; to deal with them singly, without a larger perspective on where each decision may be leading us, is to unwittingly create a haphazard-looking off-campus (and on-campus) curriculum which may (at least from the outside) seem to lack even the hidden order that the best crazy quilts include. The resulting confusion is disorienting to off-campus students, whose information about the college curriculum is limited at best anyway; and it makes large-scale program decisions difficult since there are few general rules from which to extrapolate.

I offer here seven conditions under which off-campus public-service-oriented credit instruction becomes a curricular question.

1. When the off-campus program competes with the regular on-campus program for scarce instructional resources. Not all off-campus programs are budgeted as part of the total University program, but some are, and in cases where professors' time and salary money must be diverted from the regular program to cover the outreach program, outreach programming becomes a direct curricular issue. If "regular" students' curricula are at all threatened (or even anyone thinks they will be), public service

credit instruction becomes more than a simple administrative decision. It demands curricular deliberation.

2. When the demands of "public service" instruction begin making content and other curricular demands not normally encountered in the regular curriculum. Thus, outreach students, almost all of whom are employed adults, make demands on instruction that the more docile on-campus students never imagine -- the most consistent example is for practical courses, or for practical applications of theoretical courses, (or, worse, for no theory courses), and a direct tying of course content to students' own work. To the extent that students' demands on instruction serve to change its content or its method of presentation, they create a curricular problem.

3. When a public service commitment suggests a need for new standards in admissions, in faculty hiring, in grading, in promotion, or etc. Again, this doesn't always happen, but schools which institute new "open admissions" policies face serious curricular questions; there is no reason why new student populations reached by outreach programs would not force similar curricular questions, if only by virtue of their sheer numbers.

4. When outreach programming results in questions that cannot be routinely handled by the structures already in existence. For example, if outreach programming reaches part-time students not seeking full degrees, it may be unrealistic to require them to go through the usual admission procedure of the university -- a simpler registration form may be in order, and its use may well imply decisions (by students and by administrators) which do not fit the decisions required by the regular curricular sequence. (For example, must an outreach student have the exact prerequisites listed in the course description, especially if the prerequisites are not available in off-campus locations and/or the student has gained equivalent knowledge in other ways? Or, should credits so earned be applicable to regular degree programs?)

5. When the student beneficiaries of public-service teaching programs begin demanding something more than simply the courses themselves. Outreach students (especially the serious ones) will eventually need adequate academic advising in order to make additional course decisions; they may begin to need library resources beyond the textbook and handout materials provided in the course; they may request more complete sequences of courses at their locations. Any of these changes imply curricular decisions by the on-campus administartion; they imply a demand on shared resources, and may result in shifted allocations of staff time, course offerings, and library resources between campus and outreach locations.

6. If public-service credit instruction threatens (or helps) accreditation by regional or professional accrediting agencies; or even if anyone thinks it might do either. This is the argument typically used by Colleges of Business, I think, which decline to do nontraditional off-campus credit instruction for fear that it will damage their rating with their professional accrediting association. Whether the perceived threat lies in the off-campus teaching itself or in some feared decline in instructional quality as a result of off-campus teaching, the question of outreach instruction is cast in these curricular terms by Colleges of Business and perhaps by other academic units; to the extent that public service instruction is perceived as a threat to the regular curriculum, it must be dealt with as a curricular problem.

7. When it threatens to become firmly ensconced at the institution and thus to intrude regularly into other institutional decisions. This relates

back to item #1 above, but in a more permanent sense. Outreach instruction can be a temporary and experimental aberration in the normal schedule, or it can be built into the regular load. In the latter case, it by definition becomes part of the total curriculum, making demands on the institution's instructional resources, strategy, and goals.

The above are some conditions under which outreach programming becomes a curricular problem. I see I have now backed into the fundamental question of how we know when it is a curricular problem. How do we know, for example, that the problems posed by condition #5 above are curricular, and not merely budgetary or political? That is less simply answered, though it may be clearer in the case of outreach programming than elsewhere. Most simply put, we know outreach is a curricular problem when it affects the established curriculum -- and it can affect it in any of the above seven ways (and probably others). The changes wrought by these conditions may take several forms, as all good curriculists know: they may affect the established curriculum in the form of changing the choices available to the regular students (as when we move a standard course off campus without replacing it), or affecting the content of standard courses (or even adding new ones), or changing the professional behavior of instructors by building outreach teaching into their evaluations (perhaps to the detriment of research and publishing), or subtly changing the profile of the student body (when once-part-time adult students are encouraged to come to campus for The Real Thing), for example.

In short, outreach -- public-service -- instruction at the college level may have an effect on the commonplaces (Schwab 1973) of the established curriculum: students, teachers, subject-matter and settings can all be affected in major subtle ways. Some of these changes can be absorbed painlessly as part of a natural process of curricular change; others (too often) demand head-on confrontations and long deliberation before the adjustments in the traditional curriculum can be made. KSU's College of Education, for example, has for years assigned a third of its regular teaching load to off-campus locations around the state, and the curriculum offered to its on-campus and off-campus students has evened out to some extent; the tension between "regular" and "public service" instruction in that College is minimal. The College of Home Economics, on

the other hand, while newly interested in chasing the FTEs available in the hinterlands, is feeling the curricular pressure of reassigning faculty from regular campus assignments to off-campus ones, which would leave some current students in the lurch: Home Economics' problem in entering this new arena is largely a curricular one. It touches all four commonplaces; the decision to move off-campus is a deliberative one.

Public service instruction for credit, then, may be considered a curricular problem when it influences the regular curriculum of the institution through any or all of the standard four commonplaces. It may influence them under any or all of the seven conditions outlined above. And under this concatenation of circumstances, the public service tradition of the land-grant (or any other) institution takes on a different flavor than the independent non-credit activities of Cooperative Extension alone ever produce. The different flavor is undeniably curricular in nature.

Let me hasten to add, however, that entire programs of credit instruction in a "public service mode" (as they say) can easily be independent of the regular on-campus curriculum, posing none of the problems outlined above. In the case of institutions hiring adjunct instructors, for example, paying them out of student fees, the outreach instruction is in all senses extraneous to the regular curriculum and makes almost no demands on its resources; it may by the same token have little in common with its standards, which must be why the term "extension credit" or "continuing education credit" is sometimes used in these cases where the university's role is merely one of sanctioning, judging an adjunct instructor worthy of awarding some version of the university's credits to students. My concern here, however, is with those cases where public service instruction is part of the university's regular program and therefore taken out of its hide, because it is in those cases that the strains produced by it are truly interesting in a curricular sense. It is those cases which impose genuine demands for change on an otherwise stable system. Truly curricular changes are a lot more interesting to watch than are the humdrum logistical changes that accompany them.

Public Service as a curricular problem: example & comments

Some examples of public-service instructional situations which are and are not curricular problems in the sense outlined above may serve to clarify the point here. Consider, first, the case where a four-day conference sponsored by the Family & Child Development department at KSU has a nationally known expert monitoring the conference, running all-day workshops, and the like; the University, by appointing that person as a temporary adjunct instructor, can award credit for the four days. This is not a curricular decision in the sense described above: it has no effect whatever on the total curriculum offered by that department; it is strictly bonus. The same department deciding to base one of its regular graduate-faculty members in Topeka to offer part of a Master's degree sequence there is making a curricular decision: the instructor's move will affect other instructors' loads on campus and will affect on-campus students' choices; these curricular problems will need to be resolved in a deliberative fashion before the move is ever final. Another example: there is a free university in Manhattan, vaguely tied to the University (by virtue of pursestrings I think), which offers all manner of non-credit courses for and by the community; anyone can teach. This program, while perhaps contributing overhead money to the university's coffers when it does get grants, has no measurable effect on the University's curriculum -- since it offers no credits, it does not compete. It is a friendly adjunct. Another nontraditional program, called Non-Traditional Study, attempts to put adult students into contact with faculty who can help them build portfolios and independent study programs leading toward a baccalaureate degree; this "public service" program reaches (by definition) students not enrolled in the regular curriculum but it makes demands on their regular faculty -- therefore it does pose a curricular problem for those departments getting involved in it. Its approval by the University and the Board of Regents was a curricular decision involving all four of the commonplaces.

And so on. There are endless other examples. I should mention, on a totally idiosyncratic note, that in my particular position I always know when a decision is

a truly curricular one because it gets referred out of the Continuing Education office where I work and back to the department sponsoring the course. Truly curricular decisions are made by the academic administration and not by the administrative support units; our task here is basically to make those curricular decisions possible and to make them as painless as possible.

It might be argued in rebuttal that to claim a problem is curricular because it affects the regular curriculum is a tautology. But really it is no more a tautology than the fact that the curriculum field (such as it is) exists because there are curricula in schools. There are, of course, other possible definitions of curricular problems, especially in cases where developers are starting afresh (building a new alternative school, for instance) and need not worry about strains on an existing structure. But within the context that most of us operate in, where curricula do exist, the special flavor imposed by the seven conditions I describe here does seem to signal the cases where the problem is curricular in nature. It matters. And it would be unfortunate to leave a serious curricular problem in the hands of an administrator insensitive to those nuances, for any damage wrought is also ultimately curricular in nature.

Which is why I see the problem as a non-trivial one. Problems which ultimately have curricular implications are addressed every day by scores of people whose jobs are explicitly not involved in curriculum planning: registrars, student counseling staff, library staff, continuing education administrators, and others get involved in program-related decisions all the time. Many of these decisions are fairly routine; others are not; some, if not attended to correctly from the start, can create serious curricular messes further down the line. It is, in fact, difficult to work at an educational institution without treading on the curriculum somewhere; this is especially true of people working deliberately to provide credit instruction to non-traditional "outreach" locations. It behooves us to recognize these curriculum-related problems when they appear, and to deal with them as such (even if "dealing

with them as such" means turning them over to some other unit and missing the fun of wrestling with them ourselves). This, of course, is true for any program-planning context, not merely public service units. In fact, I was pleased to recognize that the problem as I have phrased it here relates rather nicely to a conversation over coffee with a colleague, two AERA meetings ago, where we wondered "What is a curricular problem? How would we recognize one if we stumbled across it?". The question seemed too vague to tackle and I successfully put it out of mind for quite a while; but the very real and inescapable problems faced by institutions trying to reach students in the hinterlands have provided a fairly clever vehicle for raising the question again. Land-grant institutions are not unique in these respects, but they do have the advantage of offering a clear pattern of change in their instructional programs; the insights that they suggest are, I hope, applicable elsewhere as well.

In any event, I am glad to have had (at last) an excuse to define what a "curricular problem" is, partly because the friend with whom I had coffee two years ago is the critic of this session, but also because I believe this model of conditions which impinge on the commonplaces might be a useful analytical tool in settings beyond the one I have covered here.

In closing, I have to acknowledge that there are surely other ways to analyze public service as a curricular problem and that my tying the issue to Schwab's four commonplaces may be idiosyncratic: I seem to feel compelled to regularly test his commonplaces, because they seem so amazingly tidy. They are, however, very resilient -- they manage to apply to all sorts of unexpected contexts, and (more importantly) they do help me to make sense of the very diverse educational patterns which we call curricula. They are a believable way of characterizing the common concerns which I have always sensed between traditional curriculists and the likes of me and others working in adult program-planning settings. They reassure me that despite the staggering load of non-curricular problems that my colleagues and I work with daily, we <u>can</u> still remain curriculists at heart and not feel like traitors in the process. And

also I am somehow reassured to see that adult education can legitimately be tied to accepted theoretical frameworks in education; the movement afoot in "adult education" circles to claim that adults pose totally different educational problems than other students worries me a little. Many of the problems are really very similar and quite interrelated; I hope this paper can contribute to that realization.

References

Breimyer, Harold F. Outreach Programs of the land grant universities: which publics should they serve? Keynote address in Proceedings of conference of the same title, Manhattan, Kansas: Kansas State University, July 1978, pp. 5-17.

Carey, James C. Kansas State University: The Quest for Identity. (Lawrence, Kansas: The Regents Press, 1977)

Geiger, Louis G. The Morrill Act and its interpretation through practice. Manhattan, Kansas: Proceedings of the conference on "Outreach Programs of the Land Grant University: Which Publics Should They Serve?", Kansas State University, July 1978, pp. 21-36.

Harrington, Fred Harvey The Future of Adult Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1977.

Houle, Cyril O. The third era of American higher education. in Proceedings of National Conference on Public Service and Extension in Institutions of Higher Education. Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia, June 1974, pp. 37-45.

Krug, Edward A. The Shaping of the American High School. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.

Rusk, Dean Tomorrow's need: the universal man. in Proceedings of National Conferences on Public Service and Extension in Institutions of Higher Education Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia, June 1974, pp. 3-8.

Schwab, Joseph The practical: translation into curriculum. School Review vol. 81, August 1973, pp. 501-522.

Strother, George B. The university's role in public service and extension. in Proceedings of National Conference on Public Service and Extension in Institutions of Higer Education Athens, Ga.: University of Georgia, June 1974, pp. 3-8.

True, Alfred Charles A History of Agricultureal Extension Work in the United States, 1785-1923. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1928.

Vallance, Elizabeth Hiding the hidden curriculum: an interpretation of the language of justification in nineteenth-century educational reform. Curriculum Theory Network 4:1, 1973/74, pp. 5-21.